

II. RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Following the above Claims 22-30, 32-40, and 48-52 are pending in the application. Claims 22-30, 32-34, 40, and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mills et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,599,147 ("*Mills*"). Claims 35-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mills* in view of Kikinis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,522,089 ("*Kikinis*"). Claims 49-52 have been added. Applicant respectfully offers that the pending claims are patentable in light of the following remarks. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the pending rejections.

A. The Claims Are Patentable over *Kasai* Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The Examiner has indicated that claims 22-30, 32-34, 40, and 48 are anticipated by *Mills* under § 102(e). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 22-30, 32-34, 40, and 48 are patentable over *Mills* for a variety of reasons, because a variety of limitations in the pending claims are absent from *Mills*.

For example, independent claim 22 is directed to a method for loading a presentation on a handheld computing device. The method includes limitations of invoking a driver to compress image data, and invoking the driver to store the compressed image data in a presentation database. None of these limitations is described in or taught by *Mills*.

Mills relates to technology for removable expansion modules applicable to handheld computing devices. *Mills* at col. 1, lines 17-21. In the citation noted by the Examiner, *Mills* makes reference to prior art that uses compressed digital audio. *Id.* at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 2. However, the *Mills* systems do not invoke a driver to compress image data. The *Mills* systems do not include drivers for data compression, and indeed, do not perform any type of data

compression, nor do they include any tools for the compression of data. Accordingly, *Mills* does not describe or teach the use of invoking a driver to compress image data.

Further, *Mills* does not teach or describe the use of a driver to store the compressed image data in a presentation database. In the citation noted by the Examiner, *Mills* notes the use of memory adapter circuitry in closed-case expansion cards. *Id.* at col. 11, lines 17-26. However, *Mills* does not discuss the collection of compressed digital information for images in a presentation. Indeed, *Mills* does not teach or describe any technology for use with the projection of images, or any other type of presentation. *Mills* also does not disclose or teach the use of a presentation database. Thus, the limitation of invoking a driver to store compressed image data in a presentation database is absent from *Mills*.

Independent claim 48 is directed to a method for loading a presentation on a handheld computing device. The method includes limitations of invoking compression software to compress image data, and invoking organizer software to store compressed image data in a presentation database. For reasons similar to those described above regarding claim 22, none of these limitations of claim 48 is described in or taught by *Mills*.

Since *Mills* does not include all the limitations of independent claims 22 and 48, claims 22 and 48 are allowable under § 102(e). Claims 23-30, 32-34, and 40 depend on claim 22. Claims 23-30 and 32-34, and 40 are therefore also allowable under § 102(e) because the cited reference does not disclose all the limitations of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 22-30, 32-34, 40, and 48.

B. The Claims Are Patentable over *Mills* in view of *Kikinis* Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner has rejected claims 35-39 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mills* in view of *Kikinis*. *Kikinis* presents a portable computer with a user interface for keyboard inputs

and telephone dialing. *Kikinis* at FIGS. 21 and 22A-D; col. 4, lines 56-67; col. 21, lines 48-57; col. 24, lines 16-46.

Claims 35-39 are patentable over the prior art for a variety of reasons. For example, claim 35 is directed to a method for loading a presentation on a handheld computing device. Claim 35 is dependent on claim 22, and includes the limitations of invoking a driver to compress image data, and invoking the driver to store the compressed image data in a presentation database. As discussed above, none of these limitations is described in or taught by *Mills*. These limitations are also not described or taught by *Kikinis*. In particular, *Kikinis* does not discuss the use of compression techniques for the compression of image data, and does not discuss the storage of image data in a presentation database. Thus, the limitations of claim 35 are not present in the cited references.

Claim 35 also includes the limitations of a control interface that is displayed on the handheld computing device, and displays a reference to one or more presentation databases. These limitations are also not present in *Kikinis*.

An example of the interface described in *Kikinis* is used for selecting options, *id.* at col. 21, lines 35-63, and telephone numbers, *id.* at col. 22, lines 41-44, for a telephone dialer. However, the *Kikinis* interface does not display any references to presentation databases. Indeed, the *Kikinis* disclosure does not discuss, either directly or peripherally, the use of technology for presentation systems or presentation databases.

Thus, neither of the cited references, separately or in combination, teach or describe all the limitations of claim 35. Claim 35 is therefore allowable under § 103(a). Claims 36-39 depend on claim 35. Claims 36-39 are therefore also allowable under § 102(a) because the cited

reference does not disclose all the limitations of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 35-39.

C. Added claims

Claims 49-52 have been added as new claims. The new claims add no new matter to the application. Support for the new claims may be found, for example, in the originally filed specification at p. 33, line 18 to p. 34, line 2; FIGS. 7A-7D, and p. 42, lines 17-20.

D. Summary

Pending claims 22-30, 32-40, and 48-52 are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to grant early allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney for Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Cyrus F. Bharucha
Registration No. 42,324
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: September 27, 2004